

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-54 and 57 are presently pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 6, 9-11, 14-16, 22, 25, 26, 35, 36, 40, 44, 43, 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,732,349 to Sanpei et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,905,957 to Olds. Claims 5, 21, and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanpei et al. in view of Olds and in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,282,431 to Konno. Claims 3, 7, 17-19, 23, 37, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanpei et al. in view of Olds and in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,305,372 to Tomiyori. Claims 4, 20, and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanpei et al. in view of Olds and in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,085,098 to Moon et al. Claims 8, 24, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanpei et al. in view of Olds and in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,201,963 to Nakamura. Claims 12, 13, 27, 28, 30, 31, 34, 46, 49, 50, 53, 54, and 57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanpei et al. in view of Olds and in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,292,666 to Siddiqui et al. Claims 34 and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanpei et al. in view of Olds and in view of Siddiqui et al. and Konno. Claims 32, 47, and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanpei et al. in view of Olds and in view of Siddiqui et al. and Tomiyori. Claims 33 and 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanpei et al. in view of Olds and in view of Siddiqui et al. and Moon et al. Claim 52 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanpei et al. in view of Olds and in view of Siddiqui et al. and Nakamura.

Applicants respectfully traverse all prior art rejections.

The present invention as recited in claim 1 is a system for updating information stored in a memory of a portable electronic device. The system includes "a plurality of base stations, each of said plurality of base stations being located at a respective geographic location and transmitting a radio signal including information specific to said respective

geographic location,” and “a transceiver in said portable electronic device.” When the portable electronic device “comes into range of one of said plurality of base stations, said device automatically receives said radio signal from said one of said plurality of base stations and based on said information in said radio signal updates said information stored in said memory of said portable electronic device.”

Sanpei et al. discloses a communication system in which communication is initiated by the user pressing a function key. Sanpei et al. does not teach automatic communication between a base station and the portable device, admitted in the Office action.

Olds does not cure the deficiencies of Sanpei et al. Olds discloses a satellite communications system in which a portable device can initiate communications with a base station. According to Olds et al., the communication is initiated by the portable device over a pre-established satellite access channel. Thus, the process disclosed by Olds et al. differs significantly from the present invention in which the portable device automatically receives radio signals containing information from the base station within range and updates information. In Olds et al., communication is initiated after the portable device performs a task to determine the location of a “virtual point,” representative of its location, among points listed in a stored table, and subsequently a query task, which determines whether the virtual point is in a target area. If the virtual point is in the target area, no automatic initiation of communication takes place. If the virtual point is not in the target area, the portable device then performs a task to select a cell from a table to use for communication. This is the only situation described by Olds in which “automatic” initiation occurs, and the initiation takes place based on location data. Olds does not teach or suggest that when the portable electronic device “comes into range of one of said plurality of base stations, said device automatically receives said radio signal from said one of said plurality of base stations,” and “based on said information in said radio signal updates said information stored in said memory of said portable electronic device.” Consequently, the proposed combination of prior art references does not suggest all limitations as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, the Examiner's general conclusion of obviousness notwithstanding, there is no motivation in the prior art to combine the references as suggested to arrive at the present invention as particularly recited, absent an improper reliance on applicant's disclosure. Sanpei et al. discloses a base station communication system, while Olds discloses a satellite phone system. Further, even if the references were properly combinable, the combination does not produce the claimed invention. On the contrary, the combination provides, at best, a phone having both base station and satellite communication capabilities, but not the claimed invention. Claim 1, and its dependent claims 2-14, are submitted as being patentable over the cited prior art.

Claim 15 recites a portable electronic device including a processor, and a memory coupled to the processor for storing information. The device also includes a receiver coupled to the processor, the receiver "automatically receiving radio signals, said radio signals including information specific to a geographic location, said receiver providing said information specific to said geographic location to said processor." The processor, "in response to automatically receiving said information from said receiver updates said information stored in said memory based on said information specific to said geographic location." As noted above, the proposed combination of Sanpei et al. and Olds does not teach or suggest a portable device capable of "automatically receiving radio signals" and then updating stored information with that received in the radio signal.

Moreover, the Examiner's general conclusion of obviousness notwithstanding, there is no motivation in the prior art to combine the references as suggested to arrive at the present invention as particularly recited, absent an improper reliance on applicant's disclosure. Even if the references were properly combinable, the combination does not produce the claimed invention. On the contrary, the combination provides, at best, a phone having both base station and satellite communication capabilities, but not the claimed invention. Claim 15, and its dependent claims 16-29, are submitted as being patentable over the cited prior art.

Claim 30 recites a portable electronic device including a processor and a memory coupled to the processor, the memory storing information. A global positioning satellite

receiver is “coupled to said processor, said global positioning satellite receiver determining a current geographic position of said portable electronic device based on global positioning signals received directly from at least one satellite, said global positioning satellite receiver providing said current geographic position of said portable electronic device to said processor.” The processor, “in response to receiving said current geographic position of said portable electronic device automatically updates said information stored in said memory based on said current geographic position of said portable electronic device.”

Sanpei et al. does not teach or suggest a portable device having a global positioning satellite (GPS) receiver coupled to a processor. Moreover, as also noted, Sanpei also does not teach “in response to receiving said current geographic position” that the portable electronic device “automatically updates said information stored in said memory based on said current geographic position of said portable electronic device.”

Olds and Siddiqui et al. do not cure the deficiencies of Sanpei et al. Both Olds and Siddiqui et al. disclose portable GPS receivers, but neither teaches or suggests a portable device that “in response to receiving said current geographic position of said portable electronic device automatically updates said information stored in said memory based on said current geographic position of said portable electronic device.” To the contrary, Olds discloses that once a position of the portable device is determined by GPS, a communication link must be established with a satellite in order to update the information. Similarly, Siddiqui et al. discloses that once a GPS position is determined, information is updated by way of a communication link to a mobile switching center established by way of satellite. Thus, the proposed combination does not anticipate or render obvious the invention recited in claim 30.

The Examiner’s general conclusion of obviousness notwithstanding, there is no motivation in the prior art to combine the references as suggested to arrive at the present invention as particularly recited, absent an improper reliance on applicant’s disclosure. The mere assertion that the references could be combined to obtain a general benefit is not sufficient to establish prima facie obviousness. Even if the references were properly combinable, the combination does not produce the claimed invention. On the contrary,

the combination provides, at best, a phone having both base station and satellite communication capabilities, but not the claimed invention. Accordingly, claim 30, and its dependent claims 31-34 and 57, are submitted as being patentable over the cited prior art.

Claim 35 recites a “method for updating information stored in a memory of a portable electronic device.” The method includes “receiving a radio signal automatically from a base station when said portable electronic device comes into range of said base station, said radio signal including information specific to a geographic location in which said base station is situated.” Further, the method includes “updating said information stored in said memory based on said information specific to said geographic location.”

Sanpei et al. does not teach or suggest a method for updating information stored in a memory of a portable electronic device including “receiving a radio signal automatically from a base station when said portable electronic device comes into range of said base station.” In addition, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Olds discloses a portable device that initiates communication under certain circumstances, but does not cure the noted deficiencies of Sanpei et al. Claim 35, and its dependent claims 36-45, are submitted as being patentable over the cited prior art.

Claim 46 recites a method for updating information stored in a memory of a portable electronic device. The method includes “determining a position of said portable electronic device based on signals received directly by said portable electronic device from at least one global positioning satellite.” In addition, the method includes “determining a geographic location of said portable electronic device based on said determined position,” and “updating said information stored in said memory based on said determined geographic location.”

Sanpei et al. does not teach or suggest a method of updating information in a memory of a portable electronic device using a GPS. Olds and Siddiqui et al. do not cure the deficiencies of Sanpei et al. As discussed above in connection with apparatus claim 30, Olds and Siddiqui et al. disclose a portable device which includes a GPS receiver, but they do not disclose or suggest updating information based on a GPS-determined geographic

location. Olds and Siddiqui et al. utilize the GPS information to establish satellite communications links.

The Examiner's general statement that the proposed combination would perform the claimed steps is a conclusion of obviousness. There is no motivation in the prior art to combine the references as suggested to arrive at the present invention as particularly recited, absent an improper reliance on applicant's disclosure. The mere assertion that the references as combined would perform the claimed steps is not sufficient to establish prima facie obviousness. Even if the references were properly combinable, the combination does not produce the claimed invention. To the contrary, the combination provides, at best, a phone that communicates both with base stations and with satellites, which is not the claimed invention. Claim 46, and its dependent claims 47-54, are submitted as being patentable over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

Dated: May 27, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicant